

IN THE DRAWINGS

The one attached replacement drawing sheet includes changes to Figures 1 and 2. The replacement drawing sheet includes Figures 1 and 2 and replaces the original sheet that included Figures 1 and 2. Figures 1 and 2 were amended to include corresponding functional names as required by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Attachments: One Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 27, 2005. Claims 1-8 were pending in this application. Claims 9-12 were cancelled in response to a previous election/restriction requirement. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-8 and added new claims 13-20. No new matter has been added and support for the new claims can be found in the Applicant's specification.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being in narrative form and being incomplete and indefinite. Applicant has cancelled Claims 1-8 and added Claims 13-20. Therefore the Examiner's §112 second paragraph rejections are now moot and Applicant believes this application to now be in place for allowance.

The Examiner also objected to Figures 1 and 2 because the functional blocks lack a label with the corresponding functional name. Applicant has included a replacement drawing sheet addressing the functional names issues presented by the Examiner in the Office Action.

The Examiner further stated that the oath or declaration was defective for failure to include the signature and signature execution date of the inventor. Enclosed with this Office Action please find a properly executed declaration of the inventor and accompanying transmittal letter that was previously filed with the USPTO on October 25, 2001 and is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a).

The Examiner further objected to the disclosure because the specification fails to disclose section headings including Background, Summary of the Invention, Brief Description of the Drawings, and Detailed Description of the Invention. In response to the Examiner's objection to the specification for failing to provide header sections, Applicant gratefully acknowledges the suggestion, but respectfully declines to add the headings as they are guidelines and not required in accordance with MPEP §608.01(a).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Adam L. Stroud
Adam L. Stroud,
Reg. No. 48,410
Attorney
(408) 474-9064
September 27, 2005